



University of Technology Sydney
FACULTY OF ENGINEERING

**DEVELOPMENT OF A NOVEL FERTILIZER-
DRAWN FORWARD OSMOSIS AND
ANAEROBIC MEMBRANE BIOREACTOR
HYBRID SYSTEM FOR HYDROPONICS**

by

YOUNGJIN KIM

A Thesis submitted in fulfilment for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

School of Civil and Environmental Engineering

Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology

University of Technology Sydney (UTS)

New South Wales, Australia

February 2017

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to express my profound gratitude to A/Prof. Hokyong Shon for his guidance and insight. He helped me become a better researcher and a better person. I would also like to thank my external principal supervisor, Prof. Seungkwan Hong from Korea University for giving me the opportunity for the dual degree program. Many thanks as well to my co-supervisors, Dr. Sherub Phuntsho, Dr. Laura Chekli and Dr. Leonard Tijing for their support. Their help and support during my course works helped me and my research a great deal.

I would like to acknowledge MD Johir and Rami Hadad for their help in the laboratory. And the administrative support from Phyllis, Van and Viona as well. A special thanks to my dear friends Yunchul Woo, Sungil Lim, Myongjun Park, Jungeun Kim, Mingwei Yao, Fezeh Lotfi, Nirenkumar Pathak, and Jin Wang.

I also want to express my sincere thanks to Prof. TorOve Leiknes and R/Prof. Noredine Ghaffour for giving me an opportunity to research at KAUST. And I am grateful for the help of Dr. Sheng Li and Dr. Chunhai Wei. Furthermore, I thank Dr. Sanghyun Jeong for all the great times we had together.

Finally, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my beloved wife, Ester Yang and my son, Gyuhyeon Kim. Without them, I could not have had the courage and enthusiasm to go day by day in my life and have not gone through all the tough times in life. I would also like to thank my brother-in-law, Hyuntaek Yang for his kind support when I was away and busy with my research.

Last but not least, I would like to acknowledge the University of Technology Sydney for providing me full financial support throughout my time there.

CERTIFICATE OF ORIGINAL AUTHORSHIP

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as part of the collaborative doctoral degree and/or fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

This thesis is the result of a research candidature conducted jointly with another University as part of a collaborative Doctoral degree.

Signature of Student:

Date: 23/02/2017

Journal Articles Published or Submitted**

1. S. Lee, Y. Kim, A. S. Kim, S. Hong, Evaluation of membrane-based desalting processes for RO brine treatment, Desalination and water treatment (2015) 1-8.
2. Y. Kim, S. Lee, H. K. Shon, S. Hong, Organic fouling mechanisms in forward osmosis membrane process under elevated feed and draw solution temperatures, Desalination 355 (2015) 169-177.
3. Y. Kim, S. Lee, J. Kuk, S. Hong, Surface chemical heterogeneity of polyamide RO membranes: Measurements and implications, Desalination 367 (2015) 154-160.
4. *Y. Kim, L. Chekli, W. -G. Shim, S. Phuntsho, S. Li, N. Ghaffour, T. Leiknes, H. K. Shon, Selection of suitable fertilizer draw solute for a novel fertilizer-drawn forward osmosis–anaerobic membrane bioreactor hybrid system, Bioresource Technology 210 (2016) 26-34.
5. Y. C. Woo, Y. Kim, W. -G. Shim, L. D. Tijning, M. Yao, L. D. Nghiem, J. -S. Choi, S. -H. Kim, H. K. Shon, Graphene/PVDF flat-sheet membrane for the treatment of RO brine from coal seam gas produced water by air gap membrane distillation, Journal of Membrane Science, 513 (2016) 74-84.
6. *L. Chekli[#], Y. Kim[#], S. Phuntsho, S. Li, N. Ghaffour, T. Leiknes, H. K. Shon*, “Evaluation of Fertilizer-drawn Forward Osmosis for sustainable agriculture and water reuse in arid regions”, Journal of Environmental Management 187 (2017) 137-145.
7. J. Wang, N. Pathak, L. Chekli, S. Phuntsho, Y. Kim, D. Li, H. K. Shon*, Performance of a novel fertilizer-drawn forward osmosis aerobic membrane

- bioreactor (FDFO-MBR): Mitigating salinity build-up by integrating microfiltration, *Water* (2017) 9(1), 21.
8. ***Y. Kim**, S. Li, L. Chekli, Y. C. Woo, C. -H. Wei, S. Phuntsho, N. Ghaffour, T. Leiknes, H. K. Shon*, “Assessing the removal of organic micro-pollutants from anaerobic membrane bioreactor effluent by fertilizer-drawn forward osmosis”, *Journal of Membrane Science*, (2017) 533, 84-95.
 9. S. Li, **Y. Kim**, L. Chekli, S. Phuntsho, H. K. Shon, T. Leiknes, N. Ghaffour*, “Impact of reverse nutrient diffusion on membrane biofouling in fertilizer-drawn forward osmosis”, *Journal of Membrane Science*, accepted.
 10. ***Y. Kim**, S. Li, L. Chekli, S. Phuntsho, N. Ghaffour, T. Leiknes, H. K. Shon*, “Influence of fertilizer draw solution properties on the performance and microbial community structure in a side-stream anaerobic fertilizer-drawn forward osmosis – ultrafiltration bioreactor”, *Bioresource Technology*, accepted.
 11. **Y. Kim**, Y. C. Woo, S. Phuntsho, L. D. Nghiem, H. K. Shon*, S. Hong*, “Evaluation of fertilizer-drawn forward osmosis for coal seam gas (CSG) reverse osmosis (RO) brine treatment and sustainable agricultural reuse”, *Journal of Membrane Science*, (2017) 237, 22-31.
 12. *L. Chekli, J. E. Kim, I. E. Saliby, **Y. Kim**, S. Phuntsho, S. Li, N. Ghaffour, T. Leiknes, H. K. Shon*, “Fertilizer drawn forward osmosis process for sustainable water reuse to grow hydroponic lettuce using commercial nutrient solution”, *Separation and Purification Technology*, (2017) 181, 18-28.
 13. N. Pathak, L. Chekli, J. Wang, **Y. Kim**, S. Phuntsho, S. Li, N. Ghaffour, T. Leiknes, H. K. Shon*, Performance of a novel baffled OMBR-MF hybrid

system under continuous operation for simultaneous nutrient removal and mitigation of brine discharge, Bioresource Technology, accepted.

14. S. Li, **Y. Kim**, S. Phuntsho, L. Checkli, H. K. Shon, T. Leiknes, N. Ghaffour*, Methane production in an anaerobic osmotic membrane bioreactor using forward osmosis: Effect of reverse salt flux, Bioresource Technology, accepted.

** Publications made during the PhD candidature including articles not entirely related to the Thesis. * Articles related to the Thesis.

Conference papers and presentation

1. **Y. Kim**, Y. Woo, J. Wang, H. K. Shon, S. Hong, “Chemical cleaning study in coal seam gas (CSG) RO brine treatment by fertilizer-drawn forward osmosis”, 9th International Membrane Science and Technology Conference”, Adelaide, Australia, December, 2016.
2. **Y. Kim**, Y. Woo, S. Phuntsho, L. D. Nghiem, H. K. Shon, and S. Hong, “Accessing fertilizer-drawn forward osmosis for coal seam gas (CSG) reverse osmosis (RO) brine treatment”, 2nd International Forward Osmosis Summit, Sydney, Australia, December, 2016.
3. **Y. Kim**, S. Li, L. Chekli, S. Phuntsho, N. Ghaffour, T. Leiknes and H. K. Shon, “Influence of fertilizer draw solution properties on the performance of a side-stream anaerobic fertilizer-drawn forward osmosis – ultrafiltration bioreactor”, 2016 International Conference in Challenges in Environmental Science & Engineering, Kaohsiung, Taiwan, November, 2016.

4. **Y. Kim**, L. Chekli, S. Phuntsho, S. Li, N. Ghaffour, T. Leiknes and H. K. Shon, “Evaluation of Fertilizer-Drawn Forward Osmosis-Anaerobic Membrane Bioreactor System: Draw Solution Selection and Organic Micro-Pollutants Removal in FDFO”, 10th Conference of Aseanian Membrane Society, Nara, Japan, July, 2016.
5. **Y. Kim**, L. Chekli, W. -G. Shim, S. Phuntsho, S. Li, N. Ghaffour, T. Leiknes and H. K. Shon, “Selection of fertilizers as a draw solute for fertilizer-drawn forward osmosis – anaerobic membrane bioreactor hybrid system”, 2nd International Conference on Desalination and Environment, Doha, Qatar, January, 2016.
6. **Y. Kim**, L. Chekli, S. Phuntsho and H. K. Shon, “Fertilizer-drawn Forward Osmosis-Anaerobic Membrane Bioreactor Hybrid System for Sustainable Agricultural Application”, 2015 International Environmental Engineering Conference & Annual meeting of the Korean Society of Environmental Engineers, Busan, Korea, October, 2015.
7. **Y. Kim**, L. Chekli, S. Phuntsho and H. K. Shon, “Performance of a submerged anaerobic membrane bioreactor with fertilizer-drawn forward osmosis for hydroponics”, 2015 International Conference in Challenges in Environmental Science & Engineering, Sydney, Australia, September, 2015.
8. Y. Woo, **Y. Kim**, W. -G. Shim, L. D. Tijning, M. Yao, J. -S. Choi, L. D. Nghiem, S. -H. Kim and H. K. Shon, “Preparation and fabrication of graphene-enabled cast membrane for the treatment of RO brine from CSG produced water by AGMD”, 2015 International Conference in Challenges in Environmental Science & Engineering, Sydney, Australia, September, 2015.

9. S. Lee, **Y. Kim** and S. Hong, “Integrated Forward Osmosis (FO) with Membrane Distillation (MD) for RO Brine Treatment”, IWA Regional Conference on Membrane Technology 2014, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam, December, 2014.
10. **Y. Kim**, S. Lee and S. Hong, “Influence of membrane distillation on the performance and fouling behavior of forward osmosis in FO-MD hybrid system for treating primary RO concentrate”, The 7th IWA specialized membrane Technology Conference and Exhibition for water and wastewater treatment and reuse”, Toronto, Canada, August, 2013.

Presentation made during the PhD candidature including proceedings, oral and poster presentations.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AL-DS	Active layer facing draw solution
AL-FS	Active layer facing feed solution
AnFDFOMBR	Anaerobic fertilizer-drawn forward osmosis membrane bioreactor
AnMBR	Anaerobic membrane bioreactor
BMP	Bio-methane potential
CDI	Capacitive deionization
CEOP	Cake-enhanced osmotic pressure
CMC	Critical micellar concentration
COD	Chemical oxygen demand
CRCP	Cake-reduced concentration polarization
CP	Concentration polarization
CTA	Cellulose triacetate
DI	Deionised
DS	Draw solution
ECP	External concentration polarization
ED	Electrodialysis
EDGs	Electron donating groups
EDX	Energy dispersive X-ray spectroscopy
EPS	Extracellular polymeric substances
EWGs	Electron withdrawing groups
FDFO	Fertilizer drawn forward osmosis
FS	Feed solution
HA	Humic acid

HRT	Hydraulic retention time
ICP	Internal concentration polarization
MAP	Mono-ammonium phosphate
MBR	Membrane bioreactor
MD	Membrane distillation
MF	Microfiltration
MKP	Mono-potassium phosphate
MLSS	Mixed liquor suspended solids
NF	Nanofiltration
NFT	Nutrient film technique
OLR	Organic loading rate
OMBR	Osmotic membrane bioreactor
OMPs	Organic micro-pollutants
PA	Polyamide
PAFDFO	Pressure-assisted fertilizer-drawn forward osmosis
PAO	Pressure-assisted osmosis
PPCPs	Pharmaceutical and personal care products
PRO	Pressure retarded osmosis
RO	Reverse osmosis
RSF	Reverse salt flux
RSFS	Reverse salt flux selectivity
SEM	Scanning electron microscopy
SOA	Ammonium sulphate
SRB	Sulphate reducing bacteria
SRSF	Specific reverse salt flux

SRT	Solid retention time
TAN	Total ammonia nitrogen
TDS	Total dissolved solids
TFC	Thin-film composite
TN	Total nitrogen
TOC	Total organic carbon
TP	Total phosphorous
TS	Total solids
TrOCs	Trace organic contaminants
UF	Ultrafiltration
VFAs	Volatile fatty acids
XRD	X-ray diffraction
ZLD	Zero liquid discharge

Abstract

A novel fertilizer-drawn forward osmosis (FDFO) – anaerobic membrane bioreactor (AnMBR) hybrid system was proposed for the sustainable hydroponic application as well as wastewater reuse. This system consisted of three parts: (i) FDFO for concentrating municipal wastewater and producing diluted fertilizer solution, (ii) AnMBR-FDFO hybrid system for treating concentrated municipal wastewater and producing biogas as well as diluted fertilizer solution, and (iii) supplying produced fertilizer solution to hydroponics.

The FDFO performance was initially investigated to achieve simultaneous water reuse from wastewater and production of nutrient solution for hydroponic application. Bio-methane potential (BMP) measurements, which can be utilized to simulate the anaerobic process in batch mode to assess the bio-methane production potential from different substrates, were carried out to determine the effect of osmotic concentration of wastewater achieved in FDFO on the anaerobic activity. Results showed that 95% water recovery from FDFO was the optimum value for further AnMBR treatment. Nine different fertilizers were then tested based on their forward osmosis (FO) performances (i.e. water flux, water recovery and reverse salt flux (RSF)) and final nutrient concentration. From this initial screening, ammonium phosphate monobasic (MAP), ammonium sulphate (SOA) and mono-potassium phosphate (MKP) were selected for long term experiments to investigate the maximum water recovery achievable. After the experiments, hydraulic membrane cleaning was performed to assess the water flux recovery. SOA showed the highest water recovery rate, up to 76% while MKP showed the highest water flux recovery, up to 75% and finally MAP showed the lowest final nutrient concentration. However, substantial dilution was still necessary to comply with the standards for fertigation even if the recovery rate was increased.

In order to understand and predict the performance behaviour of anaerobic fertilizer-drawn forward osmosis membrane bioreactor (AnFDFOMBR), a protocol for selecting suitable fertilizer draw solute was proposed and evaluated. Among eleven commercial fertilizer candidates, six fertilizers were screened further for their FO performance tests and evaluated in terms of water flux and RSF. Using selected fertilizers, BMP experiments were conducted to examine the effect of fertilizers on anaerobic activity due to reverse diffusion. MAP showed the highest biogas production while other fertilizers exhibited an inhibition effect on anaerobic activity with solute accumulation. Salt accumulation in the bioreactor was also simulated using mass balance simulation models. Results indicated that SOA and MAP were the most appropriate for AnFDFOMBR since they demonstrated less salt accumulation, relatively higher water flux, and higher dilution capacity of draw solution (DS). Given toxicity of sulphate to anaerobic microorganisms, MAP appears to be the most suitable DS for AnFDFOMBR.

Two types of the AnMBR-FDFO hybrid systems were considered for further studies, which are (i) FDFO post-treatment of AnMBR effluent and (ii) AnFDFOMBR. The first was designed to reduce not only the effect of fertilizer DS on the bioreactor but also membrane fouling via microfiltration (MF)/ultrafiltration (UF) as pre-treatment. Besides, contaminants should be treated by three steps: (i) biological treatment, (ii) MF/UF filtration and (iii) FDFO treatment, which can enhance total rejection rate. Therefore, the behaviour of organic micro-pollutants (OMPs) transport including membrane fouling was assessed in FDFO during treatment of AnMBR effluent. The flux decline was negligible when the FO membrane was oriented with active layer facing feed solution (AL-FS) while severe flux decline was observed with active layer facing DS (AL-DS) with diammonium phosphate (DAP) fertilizer as DS due to struvite scaling inside the membrane support layer. DAP DS however exhibited the lowest OMPs forward flux or higher OMPs

rejection rate compared to other two fertilizers (i.e., MAP and KCl). MAP and KCl fertilizer DS had higher water fluxes that induced higher external concentration polarization (ECP) and enhanced OMPs flux through the FO membrane. Under the AL-DS mode of membrane orientation, OMPs transport was further increased with MAP and KCl as DS due to enhanced concentrative internal concentration polarization while with DAP the internal scaling enhanced mass transfer resistance thereby lowering OMPs flux. Physical or hydraulic cleaning could successfully recover water flux for FO membranes operated under the AL-FS mode but only partial flux recovery was observed for membranes operated under AL-DS mode because of internal scaling and fouling in the support layer. Osmotic backwashing could however significantly improve the cleaning efficiency.

A side-stream anaerobic FDFO and UF membrane bioreactor hybrid system was proposed and operated for 55 days. The FDFO performance was first investigated in terms of flux decline with various fertilizers DS. Flux decline was very severe with all fertilizers due to the absence of aeration and the sticky property of sludge. Flux recovery by physical cleaning varied significantly amongst tested fertilizers which seriously affected biofouling in FDFO via RSF. Besides, RSF had a significant impact on nutrient accumulation in the bioreactor. These results indicated that nutrient accumulation negatively influenced anaerobic activity. To elucidate these phenomena, bacterial and archaeal community structures were analysed by pyrosequencing. Results showed that bacterial community structure was affected by fertilizer properties with less impact on archaeal community structure, which resulted in a reduction in biogas production and an increase in nitrogen content.

The sustainable reuse of wastewater using FDFO was investigated through osmotic dilution of commercial nutrient solution for hydroponic application. Results from the

bench-scale experiments showed that the commercial hydroponic nutrient solution exhibited similar performance (i.e. water flux and RSF) with other inorganic DS. The use of hydroponic solution provides all the required or balanced macro- and micronutrients in a single solution. Hydraulic cleaning effectively restored water flux up to 75% while osmotic backwashing restored by more than 95% illustrating the low-fouling potential of FDFO. Pilot-scale studies demonstrated that FDFO can produce the required nutrient concentration and final water quality (i.e. pH and conductivity) suitable for hydroponic applications. Coupling FDFO with pressure assisted osmosis (PAO) in the later stages could help in saving operational costs (i.e. energy and membrane replacement costs). However, a trade-off between the process footprint and energy costs associated with the additional pressure needs to be further investigated. Finally, the test application of nutrient solution produced by the pilot FDFO process to hydroponic lettuce showed similar growth pattern as the control without any signs of toxicity or any mortality.

CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	VIII
ABSTRACT	XI
LIST OF FIGURES	XXI
LIST OF TABLES	XXVII
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Research background	1
1.2 A fertilizer-drawn forward osmosis hybrid system for sustainable agriculture and wastewater reuse.....	2
1.3 Objectives and scope of the research.....	5
1.4 Structure of the study	5
2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	7
2.1 Introduction: Water scarcity problem.....	7
2.2 Anaerobic membrane bioreactor.....	8
2.2.1 Basic concept of anaerobic membrane bioreactor	8
2.2.2 Anaerobic processes	14
2.2.2.1 Fundamentals of anaerobic processes	14
2.2.2.2 Dominant factors affecting anaerobic processes	15
2.2.2.3 Inhibition factors affecting anaerobic processes	18
2.3 Fertilizer-drawn forward osmosis	23
2.3.1 Forward osmosis	23
2.3.1.1 Basic concept of forward osmosis	23
2.3.1.2 Concentration polarization in forward osmosis	25
2.3.1.2.1 External concentration polarization (ECP).....	25
2.3.1.2.2 Internal concentration polarization (ICP)	26

2.3.2 Reverse permeation of draw solute in forward osmosis	27
2.3.3 Potential applications of forward osmosis	31
2.3.4 Fertilizer-drawn forward osmosis	38
2.4 Conclusions	42
3. EVALUATION OF FERTILIZER-DRAWN FORWARD OSMOSIS FOR SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE AND WATER REUSE IN ARID REGIONS .	44
3.1 Introduction	44
3.2 Experiments	46
3.2.1 FO membrane and draw solutions	46
3.2.2 Bio-methane potential experiments	47
3.2.3 Bench-scale FO system	48
3.2.3.1 Short-term FO performance experiments – Initial Screening.....	50
3.2.3.2 Long term FO performance experiments	51
3.3 Results and discussion	52
3.3.1 Bio-methane potential measurements	52
3.3.2 Performance of single fertilizers as draw solution	54
3.3.2.1 Water flux, water recovery and reverse salt flux	54
3.3.2.2 Final nutrient concentration after 1 day operation	59
3.3.2.3 Effect of fertilizer draw solution concentration	61
3.3.3 Performance of blended fertilizers as draw solution	63
3.3.4 Long-term experiments – Maximum water recovery, fouling behaviour and final NPK concentration	65
3.4 Conclusions	71
4.1 Introduction	73
4.2 Experiments	76
4.2.1 FO membrane.....	76

4.2.2	Draw solutions	77
4.2.3	FO performance experiments	79
4.2.4	Selection of suitable fertilizer draw solution for anaerobic fertilizer-drawn forward osmosis membrane bioreactor process.....	79
4.2.4.1	Determination of reverse salt concentration in a bioreactor based on a dilution factor	79
4.2.4.2	Bio-methane potential experiments	81
4.2.5	Models for salt accumulation in anaerobic fertilizer-drawn forward osmosis membrane bioreactor.....	82
4.2.5.1	Water flux	82
4.2.5.2	Salt accumulation	84
4.2.5.3	Draw solution dilution	86
4.3	Results and discussion	86
4.3.1	Draw solution selection protocol for anaerobic fertilizer-drawn forward osmosis membrane bioreactor and initial screening.....	86
4.3.2	FO performance	88
4.3.3	Bio-methane potential measurements	93
4.3.4	Salt accumulation in anaerobic fertilizer-drawn forward osmosis membrane bioreactor	96
4.3.5	Most suitable fertilizer draw solution for anaerobic fertilizer-drawn forward osmosis membrane bioreactor	102
4.4	Conclusions	103
5.1	Introduction	104
5.2	Experiments	107
5.2.1	FO membrane.....	107
5.2.2	Feed solution	107
5.2.3	Draw solutions	109
5.2.4	FDFO experiments	111

5.2.4.1 Lab-scale FO system	111
5.2.4.2 AnMBR effluent treatment by FDFO	111
5.2.4.3 Physical cleaning	113
5.2.5 Analytical methods for organic micro-pollutants	113
5.2.6 Characterization of the membrane surface	115
5.3 Results and discussion	116
5.3.1 AnMBR effluent treatment by FDFO	116
5.3.1.1 Basic FDFO performance: Water flux and reverse salt flux	116
5.3.1.2 Flux decline during AnMBR effluent treatment by FDFO	120
5.3.1.3 Influence of physical cleaning on flux recovery	131
5.3.2 Influence of fertilizer DS properties on OMPs transport.....	136
5.3.3 Influence of DS concentration on OMPs transport	141
5.3.4 Influence of FO membrane orientation on OMPs transport	142
5.4 Conclusions	145
6.1 Introduction	147
6.2 Experiments	150
6.2.1 Feed and draw solutions	150
6.2.2 A lab-scale side-stream anaerobic fertilizer-drawn forward osmosis – ultrafiltration membrane bioreactor	152
6.2.3 Analytical methods.....	154
6.2.4 Pyrosequencing analysis	154
6.2.4.1 DNA extraction.....	154
6.2.4.2 16S rRNA amplicon library preparation	154
6.2.4.3 DNA sequencing	155
6.2.4.4 16S rRNA amplicon bioinformatic processing.....	156

6.3	Results and discussion	156
6.3.1	Influence of fertilizer properties on FO performance	156
6.3.2	Influence of fertilizer properties on salt/nutrient accumulation in the bioreactor	160
6.3.3	Influence of fertilizer properties on biogas production	161
6.3.4	Influence of fertilizer properties on bacterial community structure from pyrosequencing analysis	163
6.4	Conclusions	168
7.1	Introduction	169
7.2	Experiments	172
7.2.1	Bench-scale FO experiments	172
7.2.1.1	FO membranes and commercial hydroponic nutrient solution.....	172
7.2.1.2	Bench-scale FO setup	174
7.2.1.3	Short and long term performance	175
7.2.1.4	Analytical methods.....	177
7.2.2	Operation of pilot-scale FDFO unit.....	178
7.2.3	Hydroponic lettuce plants experiments.....	179
7.2.3.1	Nutrient film technique (NFT) and experimental procedures	179
7.2.3.2	Response of hydroponic lettuce plants: Growth performance	182
7.3	Results and discussion	184
7.3.1	Bench-scale performance of commercial fertilizer	184
7.3.2	Performances of pilot-scale FDFO operations	190
7.3.3	Response of hydroponic lettuce plants grown in FDFO nutrient solutions	199
7.4	Conclusions	200
8.1	Conclusions	202

8.2	Recommendations	206
	REFERENCES.....	208

List of Figures

Figure 1. Draw solution recovery in FO (McCutcheon et al., 2005, Shannon et al., 2008).	2
Figure 2. Conceptual diagram of the fertilizer-drawn forward osmosis (FDFO) – anaerobic membrane bioreactor (AnMBR) hybrid process for greenhouse hydroponics.....	4
Figure 3. Global physical and economic water scarcity (2012) (WWAP, 2012).....	8
Figure 4. Annual publications of anaerobic membrane bioreactor (AnMBR) for the past 30 years as searched through Scopus (http://www.scopus.com/). The investigation was carried out with the range from 1986 to 2016 by using the keyword “anaerobic membrane bioreactor”.....	9
Figure 5. Conceptual illustrations of (a) a submerged AnMBR and (b) a side-stream AnMBR.	10
Figure 6. Four-step mechanisms for anaerobic process.	15
Figure 7. Conceptual description of (a) FO, (b) PRO, and (c) RO. In FO, ΔP is approximately zero and water diffuses to the draw side (i.e., high salinity) of the membrane with the opposite flow direction of draw salts. In PRO, water diffuses to the draw solution under positive pressure ($\Delta\pi > \Delta P$) with the opposite flow direction of draw salts. In RO, water diffuses to the permeate side with the same direction of salt flows due to hydraulic pressure ($\Delta P > \Delta\pi$).....	24
Figure 8. Annual publications of forward osmosis for the past 30 years as searched through Scopus (http://www.scopus.com/). The investigation was carried out with the range from 1986 to 2016 by using the keyword “forward osmosis”.	24
Figure 9. Schematic illustration of concentration profiles: (a) a symmetric dense membrane, (b) an asymmetric membrane with the dense active layer facing feed solution (i.e., FO mode), and (c) an asymmetric membrane with the dense active layer facing draw solution (i.e., PRO mode).....	26
Figure 10. Schematic diagram of accelerated cake-enhanced osmotic pressure (ACEOP).	27
Figure 11. Schematic illustration of the mechanism for CaCO_3 scaling formation on the active layer and bidirectional solute transport during the FO experiment using $\text{NH}_3\text{-CO}_2$ to treat a Ca^{2+}-containing feed solution (Lee and Kim, 2017).....	29
Figure 12. Conceptual diagram illustrating the role of RSF in promoting or reducing scaling in ODMPs (Zhang et al., 2017).....	31

Figure 13. Schematic diagram of the FO hybrid process combined with (a) heating for NH ₃ /CO ₂ draw solution recovery, (b) MSF or MED, (c) membrane distillation, and (d) reverse osmosis or nanofiltration.	34
Figure 14. A schematic of an integrated OMBR system containing an FO MBR and RO system for reconcentration of draw solution (Holloway et al., 2015).	37
Figure 15. The conceptual illustration of (a) fertilizer-drawn forward osmosis (Phuntsho et al., 2011), (b) fertilizer-drawn forward osmosis combined with nanofiltration as pre-treatment (Phuntsho et al., 2013a) (c) fertilizer-drawn forward osmosis combined with nanofiltration as post-treatment, and (d) pressure-assisted fertilizer-drawn forward osmosis (Sahebi et al., 2015).	40
Figure 16. Schematic diagram of bio-methane potential apparatus.	48
Figure 17. Schematic of the bench scale FO setup used in this study. The FO cell has two symmetric channels on both sides of the membrane for co-current flows of feed and draw solutions.	49
Figure 18. (a) Influence of water recovery in FDFO on biogas (i.e. methane) production by activated sludge and (b) relationship between the COD in wastewater and the final volume of biogas produced.	54
Figure 19. Diffusivity of fertilizer draw solutions as a function of initial water flux in FDFO using synthetic wastewater effluent as feed solution.	56
Figure 20. Final recovery rate as a function of initial water flux in FDFO using different fertilizers as draw solution and synthetic wastewater effluent as feed solution.	58
Figure 21. Final NPK nutrient concentration of fertilizer solution (Initial concentration: 1M) after one day operation of FDFO using synthetic wastewater as feed solution.	60
Figure 22. Final NPK nutrient concentration of fertilizer solution (Initial concentration: 2M) after one day operation of FDFO using synthetic wastewater as feed solution.	63
Figure 23. SEM images of membrane surface (active layer) after short-term (i.e. 1 day) and long-term (i.e. 4 days) FDFO operations using MKP and MAP as fertilizer DS and synthetic wastewater as feed.	67
Figure 24. Pictures of membrane surface after physical cleaning (i.e. DI water on both sides, cross-flow rate: 1,200 mL/min, 15-min operation) following long-term FDFO operations using SOA, MAP and MKP as fertilizer DS and synthetic wastewater as feed.	69
Figure 25. Final NPK nutrient concentration of fertilizer solution (Initial concentration: 1M) (a) after four days operation and (b) at the point of osmotic	

equilibrium of FDFO using synthetic wastewater as feed solution. The NPK limits were derived from (Hochmuth and Hochmuth, 2001)..... 70

Figure 26. Osmotic pressure of fertilizer draw solutions as a function of molar concentrations. Osmotic pressure was predicted using OLI Stream Analyser 3.1 (OLI Inc, USA) at 25°C. N.B. Ammonium sulphate: SOA and ammonium phosphate monobasic: MAP. 71

Figure 27. The conceptual diagram of the fertilizer-drawn forward osmosis – anaerobic membrane bioreactor hybrid process for greenhouse hydroponics..... 75

Figure 28. Schematic diagram of the AnFDFOMBR system. A_m is the membrane area, $C_{in, feed}$ and $C_{in, RSF}$ are the influent concentrations containing the respective influent and draw solutes, $C_{R, feed}$ and $C_{R, RSF}$ are the bioreactor concentrations caused by the respective influent and RSF, J_w , $J_s, feed$ and J_s, RSF is the respective water flux, FSF and RSF in FO, Q_{in} and Q_{out} are flow rates of the respective influent and sludge waste, and VD and VR are volumes of the respective draw tank and bioreactor. 81

Figure 29. Illustration of flow diagram for draw solution selection in AnFDFOMBR. 87

Figure 30. FO performance for different fertilizer draw solutions: (a) water fluxes, (b) reverse salt fluxes, and (c) reverse salt flux selectivity (RSFS). Performance ratio was determined by divided the experimental water flux with the theoretical water flux which was calculated by Eqn. (6), and RSFS was obtained by using Eqn. (7). Experimental conditions of performance experiments: 1 M fertilizer draw solution; cross-flow velocity of 25 cm/s; and temperature of 25 °C..... 89

Figure 31. Bio-methane potential results: (a) influence of fertilizers on the biogas production for 4 days of operation, and (b) comparison of biogas production with fertilizer concentration. Biogas production volumes with respect to fertilizers were determined after 4 days of operation. Experimental conditions: 700 mL of digested sludge with addition of 50 mL of each fertilizer solution; and temperature of 35 °C. 96

Figure 32. Comparison of experimental water fluxes with modelled water fluxes. Modelled water fluxes were calculated based on Eqn. (4) by using A and S parameters shown in Table 12 and diffusivity of fertilizers shown in Table 14..... 97

Figure 33. Simulated (a) water fluxes, (b) salt concentration in a bioreactor (left axis) and fertilizer concentration in draw tank (right axis), and (c) draw tank volume as a function of operation time. 99

Figure 34. Influence of fertilizers on salt accumulation in the bioreactor: (a) induced by feed solutes rejected by the FO membrane and (b) induced by the back diffusion of draw solutes. 101

Figure 35. Flux-decline curves obtained during FO experiments (a) under AL-FS mode at 1 M draw solution, (b) under AL-FS mode at 2 M draw solution, and (c) under AL-DS mode at 1 M draw solution. Experimental conditions of all FO experiments: AnMBR effluent as feed solution; crossflow velocity of 8.5 cm/s; and temperature of 20 ± 1 °C.122

Figure 36. SEM images of the active layer of (a) virgin membrane and fouled membrane under AL-FS mode at (b) MAP 1 M, (c) KCl 1 M, (d) DAP 1 M, (e) MAP 2 M, (f) KCl 2 M and (g) DAP 2 M, the support layer of (h) virgin membrane and fouled membrane under AL-DS mode at (i) MAP 1 M, (j) DAP 1 M and (k) KCl 1 M, and the cross-section under 5k X magnification of (l) virgin membrane and fouled membrane under AL-DS mode at (m) MAP 1 M, (n) DAP 1 M and (o) KCl 1 M.124

Figure 37. XRD patterns of virgin and fouled membranes: (a) comparison of XRD peaks between virgin membrane and fouled membranes with three fertilizer draw solution, (b) comparison of XRD peaks between fouled membranes with KCl 2 M and KCl crystal, and (c) comparison of XRD peaks between fouled membranes with DAP 2 M, magnesium phosphate, and magnesium ammonium phosphate (struvite). XRD analysis was performed on the active layer of FO membranes.126

Figure 38. EDX results of fouled membranes with (a) MAP, (b) DAP and (c) KCl.127

Figure 39. SEM images of (a) the active layer of cleaned FO membrane (AL-FS mode, DAP 1M) by physical washing, (b) the active layer of cleaned FO membrane (AL-FS mode, DAP 2M) by physical washing, (c) the support layer of cleaned FO membrane (AL-DS mode, DAP 1M) by physical washing, (d) the support layer of cleaned FO membrane (AL-DS mode, DAP 1M) by osmotic backwashing, (e) the cross-section of cleaned FO membrane (AL-DS mode, DAP 1M) by physical washing, and (f) the cross-section of cleaned FO membrane (AL-DS mode, DAP 1M) by osmotic backwashing.133

Figure 40. Water flux recovery after (a) physical washing and (b) osmotic backwashing. Experimental conditions for physical washing: DI water as feed and draw solutions; crossflow velocity of 25.5 cm/s; cleaning duration of 30 min; and temperature of 20 ± 1 °C. Experimental conditions for osmotic backwashing: 1M NaCl as feed solution; DI water as draw solution; crossflow velocity of 8.5 cm/s; cleaning duration of 30 min; and temperature of 20 ± 1 °C.136

Figure 41. Comparison of OMPs forward flux in FDFO between MAP, DAP and KCl: (a) under AL-FS mode at 1 M draw solution, (b) under AL-FS mode at 2 M draw solution, and (c) under AL-DS mode at 1 M draw solution. The error bars represent the standard deviation from duplicate measurements. Experimental conditions for OMPs transport behaviors: AnMBR effluent with 10 µg/L OMPs as feed solution; crossflow velocity of 8.5 cm/s; 10 h operation; and temperature of 20 ± 1 °C.138

Figure 42. Relationship of molecular weights of OMPs with OMPs flux and rejection, respectively.....	141
Figure 43. Schematic description of OMPs transport mechanisms under AL-DS mode: (a) MAP and KCl, and (b) DAP.	144
Figure 44. Conceptual diagram of a side-stream anaerobic fertilizer-drawn forward osmosis – ultrafiltration bioreactor.	149
Figure 45. Schematic diagram of the lab-scale side-stream anaerobic FDFO-UF hybrid system.....	153
Figure 46. Flux-decline curves obtained during the anaerobic FDFO-UF-MBR hybrid system under AL-FS mode with (a) 1 M KCl DS, (b) 1 M MAP DS and (c) 1 M MKP DS. Experimental conditions of all experiments: synthetic municipal wastewater as FS, crossflow velocity of 2.3 cm/s and 20 cm/s for FO and UF, respectively, pH 7 ± 0.2 , temperature of 35 ± 1 °C, and HRT of 24 hrs. Membrane cleaning was conducted every 24 ~ 30 h by applying crossflow velocity of 6.9 cm/s with DI water as DS.	158
Figure 47. Influence of fertilizer DS on (a) salt/nutrient accumulation caused by RSF and (b) biogas composition. Salt and nutrient accumulations were monitored by measuring conductivity (representing potassium ions with KCl DS), total nitrogen and total phosphorous. Biogas composition was monitored by GC-FID.....	163
Figure 48. Variations of bacterial community structures of the sludge collected from the anaerobic bioreactor.....	165
Figure 49. Variations of archaeal community structures of the sludge collected from the anaerobic bioreactor.....	167
Figure 50. Schematic diagram of the pilot-scale FO experimental set up and illustration of 8040 spiral wound TFC PA FO modules manufactured by Toray Inc.	179
Figure 51. Schematic diagram of the nutrient film technique (NFT) used in this study.	180
Figure 52. Lettuce seedlings germinated in Rockwool.	182
Figure 53. Lettuce seedlings in NFT units with three different treatments: (1) feed with FDFO nutrient solution, (2) feed with commercial fertilizer diluted with distilled water and (3) feed with half-strength Hoagland’s solution.	183
Figure 54. End of experiment with three different treatments: NFT unit feed with FDFO nutrient solution (left), NFT unit feed with commercial fertilizer diluted with distilled water (centre) and NFT unit feed with half-strength Hoagland’s solution (right).....	183

Figure 55. (a) Average water flux, (b) Final TOC concentration in the feed solution, (c) Reverse nutrient fluxes of commercial liquid fertilizer and (d) Reverse salt flux of 1.4M NaCl and 1.4M NaCl with 500 mgC/L humic acid draw solutions. Experimental conditions were: feed solution: DI water; draw solutions: commercial fertilizer Part B, 1.4M NaCl and 1.4 M NaCl with 500 mgC/L humic acid; crossflow velocity: 8.5 cm/s; temperature: 25°C; Operating time: up to 25% water recovery. Error bars are standard deviation of duplicate measurements..... 187

Figure 56. SEM images of the active layer of the virgin membrane, fouled membrane, and cleaned membrane after hydraulic cleaning and osmotic backwashing under 10,000 X magnification. 189

Figure 57. (a) Average water flux at the initial stage (i.e. up to 25% water recovery), final stage (after 75% water recovery), after hydraulic cleaning and after osmotic backwashing and water flux recovery after hydraulic cleaning and osmotic backwashing (b) Reverse nutrient fluxes of commercial liquid fertilizer. Experimental conditions were: feed solution: synthetic wastewater; draw solutions: commercial fertilizer Part B; crossflow velocity: 8.5 cm/s; temperature: 25°C; Operating time: up to 75% water recovery. Error bars are standard deviation of duplicate measurements. 190

Figure 58. (a) Water flux, (b) Osmotic pressure of commercial fertilizer and accumulated permeate volume, (c) Reverse nutrient fluxes and (d) Relative contribution of osmotic pressure and hydraulic pressure to the driving force during pilot-scale operation. Experimental conditions were: feed solution: synthetic wastewater; draw solutions: commercial fertilizer Part B; Initial DS and FS volumes were 75 L and 1000 L respectively; Operating time: Up to 250 times dilution (based on EC value). The osmotic pressure of diluted draw solution was calculated using the ROSA software (Version 9.1, Filmtec DOW™ Chemicals, USA) based on continuously measured EC values. 193

Figure 59. Fresh and dry biomass of hydroponic lettuce grown in three different treatments: T1 feeds with FDFO nutrient solution, T2 feeds with commercial fertilizer diluted with distilled water and T3 feeds with half-strength Hoagland's solution. 200

List of Tables

Table 1. Summary of AnMBR performance for the treatment of various wastewater.	13
Table 2. Operation factors dominantly affecting the anaerobic process.	17
Table 3. Inhibition factors affecting the anaerobic digestion.....	22
Table 4. Properties of the fertilizer solutions used in this study. Thermodynamic properties were determined at 1 M concentration and 25 °C by using OLI Stream Analyzer 3.2.	47
Table 5. Composition and characteristics of the synthetic wastewater used in this study (Chen et al., 2014b).	51
Table 6. Performance of single fertilizers as draw solution in FDFO using synthetic wastewater and DI water as feed.	55
Table 7. Comparison between the initial water fluxes obtained in FDFO operating with either brackish water or wastewater as feed solution.	57
Table 8. Effect of fertilizer draw solution concentration on water flux and recovery rate in FDFO using synthetic wastewater as feed solution.....	62
Table 9. Performance of selected blended fertilizers (1 M: 1 M ratio) as draw solution in FDFO using synthetic wastewater as feed solution.	64
Table 10. Performance of selected single draw solution in FDFO during long-term (i.e. 4 days) operations.	67
Table 11. EDX results of membrane surface (active layer) after short-term (i.e. 1 day) and long-term (i.e. 4 days) FDFO operations using MKP and MAP as fertilizer DS and synthetic wastewater as feed.....	68
Table 12. Experimental data for HTI CTA FO membrane properties (i.e., water and salt (NaCl) permeability coefficients of the active layer and the structural parameter of the support layer).....	77
Table 13. Details of the fertilizer chemicals used in this study. Thermodynamic properties were determined at 1 M concentration and 25 °C by using OLI Stream Analyzer 3.2.	78
Table 14. Experimental salt permeability coefficients (B) in the active layer and solute resistance in the support layer (K) with respect to fertilizer chemicals. The B parameter was obtained by using $B = Js\Delta Cm$, and the K parameter was obtained based on Eqn. (6) by using the diffusion coefficient shown in Table 15.....	91

Table 15. Ratios between the best draw solution and the draw solution itself for water flux, performance ratio, and reverse salt flux. Each draw solution was evaluated at concentration of 1 M.	93
Table 16. Concentrations of selected fertilizers in the bioreactor. These values were determined based on Eq. (8) with assumption of 9 dilution factor, and respective draw and reactor volumes of 2 L and 6 L.....	94
Table 17. Substrate characteristics before and after BMP experiments.	95
Table 18. Simulation conditions for predicting salt accumulation in the bioreactor.	98
Table 19. Water quality of anaerobic membrane bioreactor effluent used in this study. The analysis was conducted repeatedly.	108
Table 20. Physicochemical properties of OMPs used in this study.	109
Table 21. Details of the fertilizer chemicals used in this study. Thermodynamic properties were determined at temperature of 20 °C by using OLI Stream Analyzer 3.2. Mass transfer coefficients in the flow channel were calculated based on Eqns. (17) ~ (22).	110
Table 22. Speciation analysis results of 1 M MAP and DAP by using OLI Stream Analyzer.	118
Table 23. Water flux and reverse salt flux with different membrane orientation and draw solution concentration. Experiment conditions of FO experiments: DI water as feed solution; crossflow rate of 8.5 cm/s; temperature of 20 ± 1°C.	119
Table 24. Reverse salt flux of ionic species with different membrane orientation and draw solution concentration. Experiment conditions of FO experiments: feed solution of DI water; cross-flow rate of 8.5 cm/s; temperature of 20 ± 1 °C.	120
Table 25. Initial water flux and average water flux with different membrane orientation and draw solution concentration. Experiment conditions of FO experiments: AnMBR effluent as feed solution; cross-flow rate of 8.5 cm/s; temperature of 20 ± 1°C.	121
Table 26. pH of feed solutions after 10 h operation.	129
Table 27. Contact angles of fouled FO membranes. When dropping a water droplet on the fouled FO membrane at 2 M DAP DS, the water droplet was immediately absorbed by the surface and thus contact angle couldn't be measured.....	132
Table 28. Permeate OMPs concentration and OMPs rejection with different membrane orientation and draw solution concentration. Experimental conditions for OMPs transport behaviors: AnMBR effluent with 10 µg/L OMPs as feed solution; crossflow velocity of 8.5 cm/s; 10 h operation; and temperature of 20 ± 1 °C.	139

Table 29. Detailed composition of the synthetic municipal wastewater used in this study (Wei et al., 2014).....	151
Table 30. Details of the fertilizer chemicals used in this study. Thermodynamic properties were determined at 1 M concentration and 25 °C by using OLI Stream Analyzer 3.2.	152
Table 31. DNA concentration of the fouling layer collected from the fouled membrane surface with three different fertilizer DS.....	160
Table 32. Characteristics of the commercial liquid fertilizer used in this study...174	
Table 33. Composition and characteristics of the synthetic wastewater used in this study (based on (Chen et al., 2014b)).....	177
Table 34. Chemicals composition of Half-Strength Hoagland’s solution ^a.....	181
Table 35. Nutrient solution preparation using Half-Strength Hoagland’s solution.	181
Table 36. Operation costs under different process configurations.....	195
Table 37. Water quality of diluted draw solution at different stages of pilot-scale operation and final nutrient solution for hydroponic application.....	197
Table 38. Nutrient deficiencies and their symptoms (adapted from (Parks, 2011)).	198
Table 39. Standard hydroponic formulations.	199